

## SEA SYSTEMS CONTROLLER RATE INTERNAL MINUTE

## CONTINUATION SHEET

2. It appears that the reason d'être for seabed storage is twofold
- To remove submarines from public view/concern
  - To allow time (60 years?) to decide on a permanent method of disposal for the reactor.

The proposal presumably assumes that the retrieved hull in its deteriorated state will be declared to have the reactor compartment removed after disposal. The seabed storage option appears to be a short term expedient which could make the final disposal problem more difficult. Has consideration been given to removing the ends of the submarine and storing just the reactor compartment in the seabed? Presumably both deposit and retrieval could be done as a heavy lift, the pressure problem could be reduced, the tow could be dispensed with as could the settling/dewatering systems.

3. Unless storage on the seabed is the only way of reducing the radiation risk to the public to an acceptable level, it would seem probable to keep the hull afloat so that its condition can be monitored and maintained. (Presumably SSNOL does not present a risk to the public anyway at longish!)

Pt. Biscuit

Post script. A copy of the reference has been forwarded to ADNA/MT.